

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3 over Harada, but cancellation of these claims renders moot this rejection.

The rejection of claims 4-5 under § 103(a) over Harada and Freitag also is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claim 6-11 over Harada in view of Freitag.

In the present invention, among other things, a procedure for adjustment that becomes necessary as a result of a modification to a data modification process is specified, and adjustment procedure images are created and displayed before the modification is executed. Independent claims 6, 8, 9, and 11 have been amended to reflect this feature of the invention.

In contrast, in Harada even if operating procedures for readjustment before executing a modification is disclosed, no adjustment procedure images are displayed.

Freitag displays a result in response to a user command, but does not disclose or suggest displaying resulting images of processes prior to execution of the process.

Combining Freitag with Harada, therefore, even assuming such a combination would be made by one of ordinary skill in the art, still does not suggest the invention, as recited in amended claims 6-11.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant requests reconsideration of claims 6-11, withdrawal of the rejections thereto, and a prompt notice of allowance.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 16, 2004

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871